

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	. F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/575,551		05/22/2000	Raymon f. Thompson	P97-0041US3	1306	
34055	7590	11/19/2003		EXAM	EXAMINER	
PERKINS		_	KEENAN, JAMES W			
POST OFFICE BOX 1208 SEATTLE, WA 98111-1208				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
·				3652		
				DATE MAILED: 11/19/200	3	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	Applicant(s)				
		09/575,551	THOMPSON ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		James Keenan	3652				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with	h the correspondence address				
THE I - Exter after - If the - If the - If NO - Failu - Any rearne Status 1) 2a)	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.7 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replay period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statutively received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 A	I36(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT as, cause the application to become ABA g date of this communication, even if the August 2003. action is non-final. nce except for formal matte	oly be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). nely filed, may reduce any rs, prosecution as to the merits is				
Disposition of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	 4) □ Claim(s) 66-72 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) 66-72 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 						
Application Papers							
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 22 May 2000 is/are: a) ☑ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78. a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.							
Attachmen	t(s)						
2) Notice 3) Inform	te of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Inf	Immary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) formal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 3652

- 1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after allowance or after an Office action under *Ex Parte Quayle*, 25 USPQ 74, 453 O.G. 213 (Comm'r Pat. 1935). Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/19/03 has been entered.
- 2. The references crossed-off on applicant's IDS filed 9/22/03 were duplicate citations and/or were previously cited by the examiner.
- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claims 66-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 66, the preamble recites "one or more semiconductor wafers", yet throughout the body of the claim, reference is specifically made to plural "wafers", rendering the scope of the claim unclear.

Similarly, claim 69 recites in the preamble a singular "semiconductor article", yet the body of the claim refers variously to "one or more articles" and "the articles".

Claim 70 is similarly indefinite.

Art Unit: 3652

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 7. Claims 66-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over lwai et al (US-5,562,383, of record) in view of Johnson, Jr. et al (US-3,977,926).

Iwai et al show the invention essentially as claimed, as set forth in prior Office actions (paper nos. 3 and 6), but show neither pivoting the wafers to a vertical orientation prior to being placed in the processing chamber, nor spinning and spraying the wafers in the processing station.

Johnson et al show that it is well known to carry wafers in a container in a horizontal orientation (figure 1) prior to pivoting the wafers to a vertical orientation

Art Unit: 3652

(figure 2) in which they are processed, the processing involving "spinning" the wafers, as broadly claimed, in virtually any type of fluid, chemical, or mechanical treating application. Although liquid "spraying" is not explicitly mentioned, an ordinary artisan would know that such a process is obviously within the scope of the patent.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the apparatus of Iwai et al by pivoting the wafers to a vertical orientation prior to processing thereof, as shown by Johnson et al, if was desired to subject the wafers to a fluid processing rather than heat treating operation, as such processing is best performed with the wafers vertically oriented so as to provide better fluid coverage and improved drainage. Note that although Johnson et al fail to disclose any particular means for pivoting, since no such structure is recited in the currently presented claims, the Board decision as applied to now canceled claims 56, 57, 62, 64, and 65 is no longer relevant. Furthermore, the engagement head of Iwai clearly has sufficient mechanical complexity to accomplish such a pivoting movement.

- 8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- 9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Keenan whose telephone number is 703-308-2559. The examiner can normally be reached on (varies).

Art Unit: 3652

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eileen Lillis can be reached on 703-308-3248. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-305-7687.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

James Keenan Primary Examiner Art Unit 3652

jwk 11/14/03